



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,785	07/10/2003	Lawrence Wasicek	1001.1693101	2009
28075	7590	12/10/2008	EXAMINER	
CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC 1221 NICOLLET AVENUE SUITE 800 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55403-2420				NGUYEN, VI X
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3734				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/10/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/616,785	WASICEK, LAWRENCE	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Victor X. Nguyen	3734	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-40 and 44-46 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 9,16-18,22,23,30-32 and 35-37 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-8,10-15,19-21,24-29,33-34,38-40,44-46 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

DETAILED ACTION

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. In response to Applicant's remarks of 8/22/2008, the examiner has removed all prior 35 U.S.C. 112- first rejections.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2,4-5,8,10,13,20-21,24,27,34,38-40 and 44-46 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gray et al (6,461,370).

Gray discloses in figures 12-13 a medical device having the limitations as recited in the above listed claims, including: a connector 230 fixedly secures a proximal section (a proximal section occurs to the left side of 260 towards the segment 230) of a shaft or a corewire 204 to the distal section (the distal section occurs to the right side of 230 towards segment 260) and a filter 222 couples to the shaft, and where the proximal section comprises a first material which is a polyimide tube and the distal section comprises a second material, i.e., a coil spring (see col. 4, lines 54-65) which is different from the first material, where the connector comprises a third material, i.e., fabricated out of a spring material ... other options include a lubricious plastic such as polyethylene

(see col. 7, lines 51-56), and where the device further comprises a covering which is described as a polymer sheath or a bonding sleeve at step 140, figure. 10. As to claims 39-40 and 44, Gray discloses in figures 12-13a, an embolic protection filtering device having the limitations as recited in the above listed claims including: a filter assembly 222 couples to the filter wire, where the filter assembly includes a filter frame, a filter membrane at 228 and a strut at 226

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3,6-7,9,11-12,14,25-26,28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Gray et al (6,461,370).

Gray et al disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However, Gray is silent regarding the first material comprises stainless steel and the second material includes nickel-titanium alloy or a bismuth alloy disposed adjacent the connector and the connector blends the first flexibility with the second flexibility. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the first material comprises stainless steel and the second material includes nickel-titanium alloy or a bismuth alloy disposed adjacent the connector, and the connector blends the first flexibility with the second flexibility, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known

material on the basic of its suitability for the intended use or as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant arguments with respect to claims 1-8,10-15,19-21,24-29,33,34,38-40 and 44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant is asked to please refer to the modified prior art rejection above where the examiner addresses applicant's concerns regarding prior art rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor X. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4699. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8-4.30 P.M).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ho Jackie can be reached on (571) 272-4697. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Victor X Nguyen/  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3734

VN